Conductivity of weakly disordered metals close to a ferromagnetic quantum critical point

George Kastrinakis
Institute of Electronic Structure and Laser (IESL),
*Foundation for Research and Technology - Hellas (FORTH), P.O. Box 1527, Iraklio, Crete 71110, Greece**
(Dated: 19 July 2016)

We calculate analytically the conductivity of weakly disordered metals close to a ferromagnetic quantum critical point in the low temperature regime. Vertex corrections, due to both critical fluctuations and impurity scattering, are explicitly considered. We find that only the vertex corrections due to impurity scattering, combined with the self-energy, generate appreciable effects as a function of the temperature T and the control parameter a upon approaching the critical point. Our results are consistent with resistivity experiments on several materials displaying typical Fermi liquid behavior, but with a diverging prefactor of the T^2 term for small a.

Keywords : Conductivity calculation, Vertex Corrections, Quantum Critical Point, Fermi Liquid

arXiv:1605.06129v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 19 Jul 2016

1. Introduction

Itinerant electron systems display non-trivial behaviour close to a quantum critical point (QCP). E.g. some observables may diverge upon approaching the QCP. Our work is motivated by a number of experiments on several materials[1–10], which display typical Fermi liquid (FL) behaviour for appropriately low T. That is, quadratic in T resistivity and linear in T specific heat. These materials include $CeCoIn_5$[1,2], $Sr_3Ru_2O_7$[3], $YbRh_2Si_2$[4,5], $La_{2-x}Ce_xCuO_4$[6], $Tl_2Ba_2CuO_{6+x}$[7], $CeAuSb_2$[8], $YbAlB_4$[9] and $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$[10]. However, the prefactors of these quantities *diverge* in the vicinity of the respective QCP's.

We have shown in[11], via analytic diagrammatic calculations, that these facts can be consistently understood as arising from the exchange of relevant ferromagnetic fluctuations among the quasi-particles. Our approach assumes that we deal with weakly disordered metallic systems. Herein we extend our previous calculation of the conductivity in the low T regime, via a more comprehensive inclusion of vertex corrections. The latter are due both to the fluctuation potential $V(q,\omega)$ and to elastic (spinless) disorder scattering. The part of vertex corrections due to $V(q,\omega)$ yields no essential modifications on the results already obtained in[11].

2. The model

Henceforth, all momenta are 3-D or 2-D vectors, though we do not use bold letters. We consider the Green's function

$$G_o^{R,A}(k,\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon - \xi_k \pm i/2\tau_o} \ , \ \xi_k = \epsilon_k - \mu \ , \tag{1}$$

with ϵ_k the quasiparticle dispersion, μ the chemical potential and τ_o the momentum relaxation time due to impurities. In the weak disorder regime[12,13] $\epsilon_F \tau_o \gg 1$, with ϵ_F the Fermi energy. τ_o^{-1} is *important as a regulator* in the calculations. In fact, the characteristic FL T^2, ϵ^2 dependence of Im Σ in eq. (3) is due to the finite τ_o^{-1}.

The dominant electron-electron interaction is assumed to be the ferromagnetic fluctuation potential (or fluctuation propagator)[11,14,15]

$$V(q,\omega) = \frac{g}{-i\omega/(Dq^2+r) + \xi^2 q^2 + a} \ , \tag{2}$$

with g the coupling constant, ξ the correlation length and a measuring the distance from the QCP. The criticality parameter a depends on e.g. the magnetic field H, as in the systems of interest mentioned below, like $a = h^s$, $h = |H/H_c - 1|$, $s > 0$, where H_c is the critical field. The factor Dq^2 indicates disorder induced diffusion of the quasiparticles, with diffusion coefficient D[13,16].

For the purpose of our calculations, we will treat ξ and a as independent parameters. This procedure, also followed in[11], is entirely consistent, as can be seen from the details of the calculations below.

We have shown in[11] that, for the self-energy $\Sigma = \mathrm{Tr}\ G_o\, V$, the quasi-particle scattering rate is

$$\mathrm{Im}\ \Sigma(x,a) = F_D(a,\xi)\ x^2 \ , \ x = \max\{T,\epsilon\} \ . \tag{3}$$



FIG. 1: Feynman diagram for the conductivity. The continuous lines are the fermion propagators, i.e. the Green's function of eq. (5). The vertex function $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is on the left of the bubble.

Here $F_D(a,\xi)$ scales like a *negative* power of the criticality parameter a in $D = 2, 3$ dimensions. In Appendix A we explicitly derive this result for the case $\epsilon > T$.

In the following, we consider the *total* quasi-particle scattering rate

$$\tau^{-1}(T,a) = \tau_{o,i}^{-1} + 2\ \mathrm{Im}\ \Sigma(\epsilon = 0, T, a) = 2S \ \ , \tag{4}$$

with $\tau_{o,i}^{-1}$ due to impurity scattering. Then the Green's function is taken as

$$G^{R,A}(k,\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon - \xi_k \pm iS} \ \ , \tag{5}$$

i.e. it includes the self-energy of eq. (4) due to the fluctuation potential $V(q,\omega)$.

3. Calculation of the vertex corrections

We wish to calculate the conductivity σ, by including vertex corrections. Our treatment is similar to the one of Mahan[17] for electron-phonon scattering. However, ours is different in a number of aspects, due to the different $V(q,\omega)$ and $G(k,\epsilon)$ considered here, the scattering by impurities, the specific functions $f(\epsilon), n(\omega)$ defined below etc. Dell'Anna and Metzner[18] have treated the conductivity with vertex corrections for a scattering potential similar to our $V(q,\omega)$. However, disorder is *not* included in their Green's function, our self-energy differs from theirs (while d-wave form factors are included in their potential), and our results differ significantly (this is also due to the different approximations made). σ is given by[17]

$$\sigma = \frac{2\ e^2}{3}\ \lim_{\omega_0 \to 0} \frac{\mathrm{Im}\ \Pi(\omega_0)}{\omega_0} \ \ , \tag{6}$$

where we put $i\omega_l \to \omega_0$ in

$$\Pi(i\omega_l) = T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \sum_{k}\ \mathbf{v}_k\ \mathbf{\Gamma}(k, i\epsilon_n, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_l)\ G(k, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_l)\ G(k, i\epsilon_n) \ \ . \tag{7}$$

C.f. fig. 1. Here e is the charge of the electron and $\mathbf{v}_k = \nabla_k \epsilon_k$. The *vector* vertex function $\mathbf{\Gamma}(k, i\epsilon_n, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_l)$ (with ω_l the energy difference between upper and lower lines) depends on the interactions - c.f. below. We consider scattering *both* via $V(q,\omega)$ and from the impurities.

With $f(\epsilon) = (1/2)\tanh(\epsilon/2T)$[19] and $\delta \to 0^+$, it can be shown that

$$\sigma = \frac{e^2}{3\ \pi}\ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\epsilon\ \frac{df(\epsilon)}{d\epsilon}\ \sum_{k}\ \mathbf{v}_k \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}(k, \epsilon - i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta)\ G^R(k,\epsilon)\ G^A(k,\epsilon) - \mathrm{Re}\left[\mathbf{\Gamma}(k, \epsilon + i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta)\ \left(G^R(k,\epsilon)\right)^2 \right] \right\} \ \ . \tag{8}$$

This expression contains *two different* variants of the vertex function, with different energy arguments. Writing

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(k, \epsilon + i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta) = \mathbf{v}_k\ \Lambda(k, \epsilon + i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta) \ \ , \tag{9}$$

and using the Ward relation $\Lambda(k, \epsilon + i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta) = 1 + (\partial/\partial\xi_k)\Sigma(k,\epsilon)$ (c.f. ref.[17], eq. (7.1.27) and after eq. (7.3.4)), we obtain

$$\Lambda(k, \epsilon + i\delta, \epsilon + i\delta) = \Lambda(k, \epsilon - i\delta, \epsilon - i\delta) = 1 \ \ . \tag{10}$$



FIG. 2: Ladder diagrams for the vector vertex function $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. The dashed line with a cross stands for impurity scattering and the double line on the right for the potential $V(q,\omega)$.

We note that $\mathbf{\Gamma}(k,\epsilon-i\delta,\epsilon+i\delta)$ is *not* given by a Ward identity[17]. To calculate it, we turn to the respective ladder diagram approximation, *without* crossing interaction lines, in which $\mathbf{\Gamma}(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)$ obeys the equation

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)=\mathbf{\Gamma}^0(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)$$
$$+n_i\sum_q U_i(q)^2\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n)\;\mathbf{\Gamma}(k+q,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)$$
$$+T\sum_q\sum_{\omega_m}V(q,i\omega_m)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m+i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m)\;\mathbf{\Gamma}(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m+i\omega_l)\;\;. \tag{11}$$

C.f. fig. 2. $U_i(q)$ is the impurity scattering potential, n_i the concentration of impurities, and the Matsubara energies are $\epsilon_n=(2n+1)\pi T,\omega_m=2\pi mT$ and $\omega_l=2\pi lT$.

The relevant Aslamazov-Larkin (AL) diagrammatic contribution to the vertex $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ has been discussed in refs.[20,21]. However, it was shown that for the charge vertex, and in the $q=0$ limit, where q is the momentum difference of the two fermion lines at the vertex, the AL contribution vanishes. Hence we do not consider it here.

We make the usual assumption that

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)=\mathbf{v}_k\;\Lambda(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)\;\;,\;\;\mathbf{\Gamma}^0(k,i\epsilon_n,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_l)=\mathbf{v}_k\;\;, \tag{12}$$

i.e. the vector dependence is just given by $\mathbf{v}_k$.

For the solution of eq. (11), we first look at the term involving $V(q,\omega)$

$$S=T\sum_{\omega_m}V(q,i\omega_m)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m+i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m)\;\Lambda(k+q,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m,i\epsilon_n+i\omega_m+i\omega_l)\;\;. \tag{13}$$

In order to evaluate it, we consider $n(\omega)=(1/2)\coth(\omega/2T)$[19], and the function of the complex variable z

$$F(z)=n(z)\;V(q,z)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+z+i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+z)\;\Lambda(k+q,i\epsilon_n+z,i\epsilon_n+z+i\omega_l)\;\;. \tag{14}$$

Then we apply Cauchy's residue theorem for a closed contour C at infinity, thus obtaining

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_C dz\;F(z)=S+I_V+I_1+I_2+R_V+R_1+R_2+L=0\;\;. \tag{15}$$

The integrals I_V,I_1,I_2 are along the branch cuts of V and the two G's, and are given below. R_V,R_1,R_2 are the residues of $F(z)$ due to the poles of V and the two G's respectively. They are negligible, as discussed in Appendix B. L is the contribution from the poles of Λ, which will also turn out to be negligible, as shown in Appendix B.

We have

$$I_V=\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}d\omega\;\mathrm{Im}\;V^R(q,\omega)\;n(\omega)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+\omega+i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,i\epsilon_n+\omega)\;\Lambda(k+q,i\epsilon_n+\omega,i\epsilon_n+\omega+i\omega_l)\;\;. \tag{16}$$

Taking into account that

$$n(\omega-i\epsilon_n)=f(\omega)\;\;, \tag{17}$$

we also have

$$I_1=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}d\omega\;V(q,\omega-i\epsilon_n-i\omega_l)\;f(\omega-i\omega_l)\;G(k+q,\omega-i\omega_l)$$
$$\left\{G^R(k+q,\omega)\;\Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\omega_l,\omega+i\delta)-G^A(k+q,\omega)\;\Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\omega_l,\omega-i\delta)\right\}\;\;. \tag{18}$$

$$I_2=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}d\omega\;V(q,\omega-i\epsilon_n)\;f(\omega)\;G(k+q,\omega+i\omega_l)$$
$$\left\{G^R(k+q,\omega)\;\Lambda(k+q,\omega+i\delta,\omega+i\omega_l)-G^A(k+q,\omega)\;\Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+i\omega_l)\right\}\;\;. \tag{19}$$

We make the substitution

$$i\epsilon_n \to \epsilon - i\delta \ \ , \ \ i\omega_l \to \omega_0 + i\delta \ \ , \ \ i\epsilon_n + i\omega_l \to \epsilon + \omega_0 + i\delta \ \ , \tag{20}$$

with both ϵ, ω_0 *real*, which yields

$$I_V = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega \ \mathrm{Im}\ V^R(q,\omega)\ n(\omega)\ G^R(k+q,\epsilon+\omega)\ G^A(k+q,\epsilon+\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\epsilon+\omega-i\delta,\epsilon+\omega+i\delta) \ \ , \tag{21}$$

$$2\pi i\ I_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega\ V(q,\omega-\epsilon-\omega_0)\ f(\omega-\omega_0)\ G(k+q,\omega-\omega_0-i\delta)$$
$$\left\{G^R(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-\omega_0-i\delta,\omega+i\delta) - G^A(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-\omega_0-i\delta,\omega-i\delta)\right\} \ \ , \tag{22}$$

$$2\pi i\ I_2 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega\ V(q,\omega-\epsilon)\ f(\omega)\ G(k+q,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta)$$
$$\left\{G^R(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega+i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta) - G^A(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta)\right\} \ \ . \tag{23}$$

Combining I_1 and I_2

$$2\pi i\ (I_1+I_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega\ V(q,\omega-\epsilon)\ f(\omega)\ K_0 \ \ , \tag{24}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 = G(k+q,\omega-i\delta)\ \big\{&G^R(k+q,\omega+\omega_0)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta) \\ &-G^A(k+q,\omega+\omega_0)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+\omega_0-i\delta)\big\} \\ +G(k+q,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta)\ \big\{&G^R(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega+i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta) \\ &-G^A(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta)\big\} \ \ . \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We want $\Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+i\delta)$, which enters the formula for the conductivity. Taking $\omega_0 \to 0$, we see that the term $G^R G^A\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+i\delta)$ is multiplied by a total *zero prefactor*, due to the opposite signs of the contributions from I_1 and I_2.

The only surviving contribution is

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 = &G^R(k+q,\omega+\omega_0)\ G^R(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega+i\delta,\omega+\omega_0+i\delta) \\ &-G^A(k+q,\omega+\omega_0)\ G^A(k+q,\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\omega-i\delta,\omega+\omega_0-i\delta) \ \ . \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We use eq. (10) and the approximate form $f(x) = x/(4T)$ for $|x| < 2T$ and $f(x) = \mathrm{sgn}(x)/2$ for $|x| > 2T$. Also, for the term K_0 we make the approximation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega\ V(q,\omega-\epsilon)\ f(\omega)\ \left[\left(G^R(k+q,\omega)\right)^2 - \left(G^A(k+q,\omega)\right)^2\right]$$
$$\simeq -4\ i\ S\ \left(G^R(k+q,\epsilon=0)G^A(k+q,\epsilon=0)\right)^2 \int_{-C_0}^{+C_0} d\omega\ V(q,\omega)\ f(\omega)\ (\omega-\xi_{k+q}) \ \ , \tag{27}$$

recalling that the derivative $df(\epsilon)/d\epsilon$ in eq. (8) yields $\epsilon \simeq 0$ for low T. The integration cutoff C_0 is of the order of μ.

To simplify the notation, we write

$$\Lambda(k,\epsilon) \equiv \Lambda(k,\epsilon+i\delta,\epsilon-i\delta) \ \ . \tag{28}$$

We also consider the approximate form $n(x) = T/x$ for $|x| < 2T$ and $n(x) = \mathrm{sgn}(x)/2$ for $|x| > 2T$, and we also make the approximation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega\ \mathrm{Im}\ V^R(q,\omega)\ n(\omega)\ G^R(k+q,\epsilon+\omega)\ G^A(k+q,\epsilon+\omega)\ \Lambda(k+q,\epsilon+\omega)$$
$$\simeq G^R(k+q,\epsilon)\ G^A(k+q,\epsilon)\ \Lambda(k+q,\epsilon) \int_{-C_0}^{+C_0} d\omega\ \mathrm{Im}\ V^R(q,\omega)\ n(\omega) \ \ . \tag{29}$$

In this way we obtain

$$I_V = G^R(k+q,\epsilon)\; G^A(k+q,\epsilon)\; \Lambda(k+q,\epsilon)\; P(q) \;\; , \tag{30}$$

$$P(q) = \frac{g}{\pi}\left\{ \frac{2\; T\; h_q}{a_q}\; \arctan\left(\frac{2\; T}{a_q\; h_q}\right) + \frac{h_q^2}{2}\; \ln\left(\frac{(h_q\; a_q)^2 + C_0^2}{(h_q\; a_q)^2 + 4T^2}\right)\right\} \;\; , \tag{31}$$

with $h_q = r + Dq^2$ and $a_q = a + \xi^2 q^2$.

Considering that the dominant momenta $k \sim k_F$ (k_F is the Fermi momentum, so that v_k^2 can be inserted in the integrand below), we obtain the equation for $\Lambda(k,\epsilon)$

$$\Lambda(k,\epsilon) = 1 + \sum_q \left\{ n_i\; U_i^2(q) - P(q)\right\}\; \Lambda(k+q,\epsilon)\; G^R(k+q,\epsilon)\; G^A(k+q,\epsilon)\; \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right) + \sum_q \left(G^R(k+q,0)\; G^A(k+q,0)\right)^2\; \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right)\; P_{12}(q) \;\; , \tag{32}$$

where

$$P_{12}(q) = -\frac{2g\; S}{\pi}\; \left\{ a_q\; h_q \ln\left(\frac{(h_q\; a_q)^2 + C_0^2}{(h_q\; a_q)^2 + 4T^2}\right) + a_q\; h_q - \frac{a_q^2\; h_q^2}{2T}\; \arctan\left(\frac{2T}{a_q\; h_q}\right)\right\} \;\; . \tag{33}$$

Then, we further assume that, for $k \sim k_F$, Λ is very weakly dependent on $|q| \ll |k|$, i.e. $\Lambda(k+q,\epsilon) \simeq \Lambda(k,\epsilon)$, and note that the contribution from $G^R G^A$ in the integration over q is subleading compared to the other terms. This yields

$$\Lambda(k,\epsilon) = \frac{1+Q_k}{1 - R_k\; G^R(k,\epsilon)\; G^A(k,\epsilon)} \;\; , \tag{34}$$

where

$$R_k = \sum_q \left\{ n_i\; U_i^2(q) - P_q\right\}\; \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right) \;\; , \;\; Q_k = \left\{ G^R(k,0)\; G^A(k,0)\right\}^2\; \sum_q \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right)\; P_{12}(q) \;\; . \tag{35}$$

4. Calculation of the conductivity

Taking into account eqs. (8),(34), σ is given by

$$\sigma = \frac{e^2}{3\;\pi}\; \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\; d\epsilon\; \frac{df(\epsilon)}{d\epsilon}\; \sum_k\; v_k^2\; \left\{ \frac{(1+Q_k)\; G^R(k,\epsilon)\; G^A(k,\epsilon)}{1 - R_k\; G^R(k,\epsilon)\; G^A(k,\epsilon)} - \mathrm{Re}\left(G^R(k,\epsilon)\right)^2\right\} \;\; . \tag{36}$$

This is the central result of this work. Considering the limit of low T we have

$$\sigma = \frac{e^2}{3\;\pi}\; \sum_k\; v_k^2\; \left\{ \frac{(1+Q_k)\; G^R(k,0)\; G^A(k,0)}{1 - R_k\; G^R(k,0)\; G^A(k,0)} - \mathrm{Re}\left(G^R(k,0)\right)^2\right\} \;\; . \tag{37}$$

We write

$$R_k = R_{1k} + R_{2k} \;\; , \tag{38}$$

where

$$R_{1k} = -\sum_q P(q) \;\; , \tag{39}$$

$$R_{2k} = \sum_q n_i\; U_i^2(q)\; \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right) + \sum_q P(q)\; \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\; \mathbf{v}_k}{v_k^2}\right) \;\; . \tag{40}$$

Incidentally, we note that the *transport* scattering rate, due to the impurities, $\tau_{tr}^{-1} = \sum_q n_i\ U_i^2(q)\left(1 - \mathbf{v}_{k+q}\ \mathbf{v}_k/v_k^2\right)$ comes from the term R_{2k}.

Considering $|q| \ll |k|$, we have $\mathbf{v}_{k+q}\ \mathbf{v}_k = v_k^2 + B_{1k}\ q + B_{2k}\ q^2 + ...$ and the *dominant* contribution for the criticality parameter $a \to 0$ comes from the term R_{1k}. This is the case because higher powers of q in the numerator of the integrand in eq. (35) yield terms *less* singular in the parameter a.

We evaluate R_{1k}. The interesting contribution, including negative powers of a, arises from the low T limit, with $2T < a_q\ h_q$. Hence we consider a minimum q_T given by $2T = a_{q_T}\ h_{q_T}$. As in[11] we consider a maximum $q_{max} = 1/2\tau_o v_F$, where v_F is the Fermi velocity. Also we approximate the logarithm in P_q as $l_0 = \ln(C_0/a_0 h_0)$, where $a_0 = a_q, h_0 = h_q$ with $q = q_{max}$.

Then in 3-D

$$R_{1k} = -\frac{g}{2\pi^2}\left(\frac{2T^2}{\xi^3\sqrt{a}}\left\{\arctan\left(\frac{\xi q_{max}}{\sqrt{a}}\right) - \frac{1}{\xi q_{max}}\right\} + q_{max}^3\ l_0\left\{\frac{r^2}{3} + \frac{2rD\ q_{max}^2}{5} + \frac{D^2\ q_{max}^4}{7}\right\}\right)\ , \tag{41}$$

while in 2-D

$$R_{1k} = -\frac{g}{2\pi}\left(\frac{2T^2}{\xi^2}\left\{\frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{\xi^2 q_{max}^2}\right\} + q_{max}^2\ l_0\left\{\frac{r^2}{2} + \frac{rD\ q_{max}^2}{2} + \frac{D^2\ q_{max}^4}{6}\right\}\right)\ . \tag{42}$$

We note that, upon assuming the Gaussian regime $\xi^2\ a = \text{const.}$[14,15], there is *no* diverging factor in R_{1k} for $a \to 0$. This possibility only arises if ξ and a are *independent* parameters - c.f. also[11]. We do not explicitly evaluate the integral in Q_k of eq. (35) because it does not yield any diverging factor for $a \to 0$. As discussed below, overall vertex corrections due to $V(q,\omega)$ do not modify appreciably the conductivity in the vicinity of the critical point.

To further evaluate the conductivity, we assume a parabolic dispersion relation ϵ_k so that $v_k = k/m$, with m the mass of the electrons, as in eq. (18) in[11]. Then, with $x = \epsilon_k - \mu$, N_F the density of states at the Fermi level and now taking both R_k and Q_k *independent* of k and evaluated at $k = k_F$, we obtain

$$\sigma = \frac{2\ e^2\ N_F}{3\ \pi\ m}\ \int_{-\mu}^{\infty} dx\ (x+\mu)\left\{\frac{1+Q_k}{x^2 + S^2 - R_k} + \frac{S^2 - x^2}{(x^2+S^2)^2}\right\}\ . \tag{43}$$

This yields

$$\sigma = \frac{2\ e^2\ N_F}{3\ \pi\ m}\ \left\{(1+Q_k)\frac{\mu}{S_0}\left[\frac{\pi}{2} + \arctan\left(\frac{\mu}{S_0}\right)\right] + \frac{(1+Q_k)}{2}\ \ln\left(\frac{E_0^2 + S_0^2}{\mu^2 + S_0^2}\right) + 1 - \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{E_0^2 + S^2}{\mu^2 + S^2}\right)\right\}\ , \tag{44}$$

with $E_0 \sim O(\mu)$ (the upper limit of integration was taken as E_0 for the ln(...) terms, which are ultraviolet divergent) and $S_0 = \sqrt{S^2 - R_k}$.

This expression is very *similar* to eq. (18) in[11] (modulo a sheer numerical prefactor), which includes a part of the vertex corrections due to impurity scattering, as we explain in the following. For reference, the final simplified expression for the conductivity in[11], given after eq. (18) therein, is $\sigma = 4\pi\ e^2 N_F \epsilon_F/(m\ \sqrt{S^2 - u_o})$ (where $u_o = n_i V_i^2$, with V_i the typical value of the impurity scattering potential $U_i(q)$).

Here, the vertex correction term $Q_k \propto S\ [G^R(k_F,0)\ G^A(k_F,0)]^2 = 1/S^3$, where S contains a *negative power law* of $a \to 0$ (times T^2). Hence Q_k is *negligible*. The two remaining logarithmic terms in eq. (44) practically cancel each other. Further, the factor R_k, which also emanates from the vertex corrections, enters in the combination $S^2 - R_k$ in the final expression for the conductivity. It does not modify in an essential manner the dependence on either T or $a \to 0$. Notably the *square* of S, yielding the main a and T dependence, is combined with the linear in R_k term. Manifestly R_k is less singular than S^2 for $a \to 0$[11], and overall of smaller magnitude. In other words, as in[11], the main dependence of the conductivity σ on T and a is due to the combination of the self-energy of eq. (4) and of the vertex corrections from impurity scattering. The contribution of the vertex corrections from the fluctuation potential $V(q,\omega)$ is *not* essential.

5. Overview

We calculate the conductivity, including vertex corrections due to both critical fluctuations and disorder, in a weakly disordered metal close to a quantum critical point. We explicitly show that no appreciable effect results due to the fluctuation part of the vertex corrections. Our results are in very good agreement with relevant experiments in several materials[1–10], and complement our previous calculation which did not explicitly consider vertex corrections[11] due to $V(q,\omega)$. The characteristic Fermi liquid $A\ T^2$ dependence for the resistivity, with a prefactor A diverging as $a \to 0$, found therein thus remains valid.

Appendix A : On the calculation of the scattering rate

The derivation below follows that of[11], i.e. (I), and equation numbers refer to (I) as well. In the limit $T \to 0$ the thermal function $X = \coth(\omega/2T) + \tanh((\epsilon-\omega)/2T)$ in eq. (I-4) becomes $X = 2$ for $2T < \omega < \epsilon$, and $X = 0$ for $\omega < -2T$ and $\omega > \epsilon$. Then the integration over ω - compare with eq. (I-7) - amounts to

$$2\int_{2T}^{\epsilon} d\omega \ \mathrm{Im}\, V(q,\omega)\ R(q,\omega) \simeq g\ R_0\ \ln\left(\frac{(h_q\ a_q)^2+\epsilon^2}{(h_q\ a_q)^2+4T^2}\right) \simeq g\ R_0\ \frac{\epsilon^2}{(h_q\ a_q)^2}\ \ , \tag{45}$$

for $h_q\ a_q > \epsilon$. The rest of the algebra proceeds as in eq. (I-8) and onwards. Thus the scattering rate scales like ϵ^2 as well, as expected for the FL regime.

Appendix B : The terms R_V, R_1, R_2, L in eq. (15)

The terms R_1, R_2 each contain a single propagator G. Hence, upon the final integration over momentum k they both yield a small contribution. This is the case because this integration is *similar* to an integration over ϵ_k from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, which can be taken as part of a contour integral closing at infinity. That contour can be taken such that the pole of the G in the integrand lies outside of it, and hence yields a zero contribution. C.f. also ref.[17].

The term R_V is due to the residue from the pole $z = z_0 = -i\ a_q\ h_q$ of $V(q,z)$. Here both G's enter the formula for the residue. However, their poles are on the same semi-plane (i.e. in a combination $G^A G^A$), and the argument for R_1, R_2 applies as well.

The term L is the residue from the 2 poles $z = z_k, z_k^*$ of $\Lambda(k,z)$ - c.f. eqs. (34),(35) - with

$$z_k = \xi_k + i\ W_k\ \ ,\ \ W_k^2 = S^2 - R_k\ \ . \tag{46}$$

Considering the function

$$H(z) = n(z)\ V(q,z)\ G(k+q, i\epsilon_n + z + i\omega_l)\ G(k+q, i\epsilon_n + z)\ R_{k+q} \tag{47}$$

we have

$$L = \frac{H(z_{k+q})}{z_{k+q} - z_{k+q}^*} + \frac{H(z_{k+q}^*)}{z_{k+q}^* - z_{k+q}}\ \ . \tag{48}$$

This term is much smaller than I_V because $|\mathrm{Im}\ H(z)| \ll |\mathrm{Re}\ H(z)|$.

* e-mail : kast@iesl.forth.gr ; giwkast@gmail.com

[1] J. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, (2006) 106606.
[2] A. Bianchi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, (2003) 257001.
[3] S.A. Grigera et al., Science **294**, (2001) 329.
[4] P. Gegenwart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, (2002) 056402.
[5] P. Gegenwart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, (2005) 076402.
[6] N.P. Butch et al., PNAS **109**, (2012) 8440.
[7] T. Shibauchi et al., PNAS **105**, (2008) 7120.
[8] L. Balicas et al., Phys. Rev. B **72**, (2005) 064422.
[9] S. Nakatsuji et al., Nature Phys. **4**, (2008) 603.
[10] J.G. Analytis et al., Nature Physics **10**, (2014) 194.
[11] G. Kastrinakis, Europhysics Letters **112**, (2015) 67001.
[12] A.A. Abrikosov, L.P. Gorkov and I.E. Dzyaloshinski, Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics, Prentice-Hall (Cliffwoods, NY), (1964).
[13] P.A. Lee and T.V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, (1985) 287.
[14] J. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, (1976) 1165.
[15] A.J. Millis, Phys. Rev. B **48**, (1993) 7183.
[16] G. Kastrinakis, Phys. Rev. B. **72**, (2005) 075137.
[17] G.D. Mahan, Many-Particle Physics, 2nd edition, Plenum Press (NY), 1990. The relevant material is mostly in section 3 of chapter 7.
[18] L. Dell' Anna and W. Metzner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, (2007) 136402; Erratum Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, (2009) 159904.
[19] For the use of functions $f(\epsilon)$ and $n(\omega)$ we follow ref.[12].
[20] A.V. Chubukov and D.L. Maslov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, (2009) 216401.
[21] S.S. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **80**, (2009) 165102.